UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,003	12/19/2003	David Matthews	PC19084/AG0116-US	1322

28940 7590 05/25/2006

AGOURON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
10777 SCIENCE CENTER DRIVE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
NASHED, NASHAAT T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1656	

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/616,003	MATTHEWS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D.	1656	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *1* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-3, 8, 10, 12, and 17-21, drawn to nucleic acid encoding PIN1 PPIase of SEQ ID NO: 2, vector and host cell comprising said nucleic acid, and a recombinant method to make the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2, classified in class 536, subclass 23.2 and class 435, subclass 233.

II. Claims 4 and 14, drawn to the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2, classified in class 435, subclass 233.

III. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, and 17-21, drawn to nucleic acid encoding PIN1 PPIase of SEQ ID NO: 4, vector and host cell comprising said nucleic acid, and a recombinant method to make the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4, classified in class 536, subclass 23.2 and class 435, subclass 233.

IV. Claims 7, and 14-16, drawn to the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4, classified in class 435, subclass 233.

V. Claims 22-24, drawn to an assay method for the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2, classified in class 435, subclass 435.

VI. Claims 22-24, drawn to an assay method for the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4, classified in class 435, subclass 435.

VII. Claims 25, 26, 28-36 and 45-47, drawn to a crystal structure of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 and computer readable medium, classified in class 369.

VIII. Claims 25, 27-36 and 45-47, drawn to a crystal structure of the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4 and computer readable medium, classified in class 369.

IX. Claims 37-44 and 49-52, drawn to a method of identifying modulator of PPIase using the atomic coordinates of Table 3 (*in silico* method), classified in class 702, subclass 27.

X. Claims 48, drawn to method of obtaining structure information utilizing the coordinates in Table 3, classified in class 702, subclass 27.

XI. Claims 53-56, drawn to *in vitro* method of identifying modulator, classified in class 435, subclass 4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are independent chemical entities and require separate searches in the patent and non-patent literature.

The nucleic acids of inventions III and I and the methods of inventions V, VI, IX, and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the nucleic acids of inventions II and I are not disclosed as capable of being used in the methods of inventions V, VI, IX, and X.

The nucleic acids of inventions III and I, and the crystal structures and the machine-readable medium of inventions VII and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

Inventions II, and III and XI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 can be used in a method to make antibody.

Inventions IV and VI and XI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4 can be used in a method to make antibody.

The polypeptide of invention II, and the methods of inventions IX and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are independent chemical entities and require separate searches in the patent and non-patent literature. The methods of inventions IX and X do not utilize the polypeptide of invention II.

The polypeptide of invention II, and the crystal structure and machine-readable medium of inventions VII and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be

shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are independent chemical entities and require separate searches in the patent and non-patent literature. The polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2 and the crystal structure are not disclosed as capable of using together.

The polypeptide of invention IV, and the crystal structure and machine-readable medium of inventions VII and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are independent chemical entities and require separate searches in the patent and non-patent literature. The polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 4 and the crystal structure are not disclosed as capable of using together.

The polypeptide of invention IV, and the methods of inventions IX and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are independent chemical entities and require separate searches in the patent and non-patent literature. The methods of inventions IX and XI do not utilize the polypeptide of invention IV.

The crystal structures and computer readable mediums of inventions VII and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together.

The crystal structure of inventions VII and VIII and the method of invention IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the crystal structures of inventions VII and VIII can be utilized in different method to identify mutants of PPIase or the method of invention XI.

The crystal structure of inventions VII and VIII and the method of invention X are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the crystal structures of inventions VII and VIII can be utilized in different method to identify mutants of PPIase or the method of invention XI.

The crystal structure of inventions VII and VIII and the method of invention XI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the crystal structures of inventions VII and VIII can be utilized in different method to identify mutants of PPIase or the method of invention IX.

The methods of inventions IX, X, and XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions are independent methods having different steps and products.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims

and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0934. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWTF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen M. Kerr can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nashaat T. Nashed, Ph. D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1656

***